

THIS OPINION WAS NOT WRITTEN FOR PUBLICATION

The opinion in support of the decision being entered today  
(1) was not written for publication in a law journal and  
(2) is not binding precedent of the Board.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES

---

Ex parte YUKIHITO OOWAKI

---

Appeal No. 1998-0449  
Application 08/578,900

---

HEARD: February 9, 2000

---

Before JERRY SMITH, DIXON and FRAHM, Administrative Patent Judges.

JERRY SMITH, Administrative Patent Judge.

DECISION ON APPEAL

This is a decision on the appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134  
from the examiner's rejection of claims 15-28, which  
constitute all the claims remaining in the application.

The disclosed invention pertains to a semiconductor  
memory device.

Representative claim 15 is reproduced as follows:

15. A semiconductor memory device comprising:

an array of memory cells subdivided into at least first and second memory banks;

bit lines and word lines electrically coupled to said memory cells, respectively;

an address bus section for said first and second memory banks;

first data transmission lines independently provided for each of said memory banks;

column select lines for switching said bit lines of memory cells to said first data transmission lines; and

column select signal latch circuits coupled to said address bus section and said column select lines, and respectively provided for each of said first and second memory banks.

The examiner relies on the following reference:

Pinkham	4,683,555	July 28, 1987
---------	-----------	---------------

Claims 15-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the disclosure of Pinkham.

Rather than repeat the arguments of appellant or the examiner, we make reference to the briefs and the answer for the respective details thereof.

#### OPINION

We have carefully considered the subject matter on appeal, the rejection advanced by the examiner and the evidence of anticipation relied upon by the examiner as support for the rejection. We have, likewise, reviewed and taken into consideration, in reaching our decision, the

appellant's arguments set forth in the briefs along with the examiner's rationale in support of the rejection and arguments in rebuttal set forth in the examiner's answer.

It is our view, after consideration of the record before us, that the disclosure of Pinkham does not fully meet the invention as set forth in claims 15-28. Accordingly, we reverse.

Anticipation is established only when a single prior art reference discloses, expressly or under the principles of inherency, each and every element of a claimed invention as well as disclosing structure which is capable of performing the recited functional limitations. RCA Corp. v. Applied Digital Data Sys., Inc., 730 F.2d 1440, 1444, 221 USPQ 385, 388 (Fed. Cir.); cert. dismissed, 468 U.S. 1228 (1984); W.L. Gore and Assocs., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc., 721 F.2d 1540, 1554, 220 USPQ 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 851 (1984).

With respect to independent claim 15, the examiner indicates how he reads the invention on the disclosure of Pinkham [final rejection, Paper No. 7]. Appellant argues that the examiner has read the claimed invention on improper elements of the Pinkham disclosure [brief, pages 4-5]. Appellant also argues that regardless of whether the claimed

column select signal latch circuits are considered to be the tap latches of Pinkham or the tap latches in combination with the column address latch and column decoder of Pinkham, the specific recitations of claim 15 are not obtained [reply brief, pages 1-3]. We agree with appellant.

The examiner has read the claimed column select latch circuits on Pinkham's tap latches 42-48. These latches are connected to a decoder shared by the column select circuits and the tap latches [30, 52]. A single decoder [30, 52] provides column select signals to column select circuits 30 of each memory as well as tap latch signals to each tap latch 42-48. The column select lines of claim 15 must be the unnumbered bus lines of Pinkham which connect the decoder [30, 52] to the column select circuits 30. Note that this bus is different from bus number 50 which connects the decoder [30, 52] to the tap latches. If the tap latches are considered to be the column select signal latch circuits of claim 15, then there is no coupling of these circuits to the column select lines as recited in claim 15. The tap latches are only connected to bus line 50 which is not the same as the column select lines which switch bit lines of the memory cells to the data transmission lines [I/O<sub>0-3</sub>] as recited in claim 15.

Since there is at least one recitation of independent claim 15 which is not fully met by the disclosure of Pinkham, we do not sustain the rejection of claim 15. Independent claim 21 has a similar recitation to claim 15 so that we also do not sustain the rejection of claim 21. All the remaining claims are dependent claims which depend from either claim 15 or claim 21.

Since the independent claims are not anticipated by the disclosure of Pinkham, the dependent claims are also not anticipated by the disclosure of Pinkham.

In summary, we have not sustained the examiner's rejection of claims 15-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Therefore, the decision of the examiner rejecting claims 15-28 is reversed.

REVERSED

Jerry Smith	)
Administrative Patent Judge	)
	)
	)
	)
Joseph L. Dixon	) BOARD OF PATENT

Appeal No. 1998-0449  
Application 08/578,900

Administrative Patent Judge	)	APPEALS AND
	)	
	)	
	)	INTERFERENCES
Eric S. Frahm	)	)
Administrative Patent Judge	)	

JS/cam

Appeal No. 1998-0449  
Application 08/578,900

Oblon, Spivak, McClelland,  
Maier & Neustadt  
Fourth Floor  
1755 Jefferson Davis Hwy.  
Arlington, VA 22202